

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>		<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/717,721		PAVLIK ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>		<b>Art Unit</b>	
	TAMMIE HELLER		3766	

  

**All Participants:**

(1) TAMMIE HELLER.

(2) Reed Duthler.

**Date of Interview:** 10 February 2010

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant    ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes    ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

NA

Claims discussed:

1-6, 8-13, 15-29

Prior art documents discussed:

*Westlund, previously cited*

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

**Status of Application:** REJECTED

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Time:** 2 PM

  

/Tammie Heller/  
Examiner, Art Unit 3766

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: On February 3, 2010, the Examiner contacted the Applicant's representative, Carol Barry, to discuss proposed amendments to place the claims in better form for allowance. The proposed amendments were to focus on the language of newly-added claim 29 to require a groove located on an inner surface of a tubular member. Ms. Barry indicated that a colleague, Reed Duthler, would be more appropriate to speak to regarding such amendments. On February 10, 2010, the Examiner contacted Mr. Duthler to discuss the proposed amendment. Mr. Duthler did not agree to the proposed amendments to the claims, and as such, the attached Final Rejection is hereby issued.